## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

**HEARING #10877** 

AUGUST 7, 2007

1:00 P.M.

DOCKET NO. ND-2007-3-WS

WORKSHOP — Water and Sewer Maintenance Practices

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS VOLUME 1 OF 1

**HEARING BEFORE**: G. O'Neal Hamilton, *Chairman*, C. Robert Moseley, *Vice Chairman*; and COMMISSIONERS John E. "Butch" Howard, David A. Wright, Elizabeth G. "Lib" Fleming, Mignon L. Clyburn, and Randy Mitchell.

**STAFF:** Charles L.A. Terreni, Chief Clerk/Administrator; Jocelyn G. Boyd, Deputy Clerk; Joseph Melchers, Chief Legal Advisor; F. David Butler, Senior Counsel, and Randall Dong, Esq., Legal Staff; James Spearman, PhD., Executive Assistant to Commissioners; William Richardson and Patty Sands, Commission Staff; Jo Elizabeth M. Wheat, CVR-CM-GNSC, Court Reporter; and Deborah Easterling, Hearing Room Assistant.

## **APPEARANCES:**

NANETTE EDWARDS, ESQUIRE, representing THE OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

101 EXECUTIVE CENTER DRIVE COLUMBIA, SC 29210

POST OFFICE BOX 11649 COLUMBIA, SC 29211

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Please be seated. We'll call the workshop to order, and I thank each of you for being here today and being willing to participate in the discussions. As you know, this is a procedure that the Commission has followed in preparing for promulgating our regulations. We would like to know how you feel and have the benefit of your knowledge before we get that far along, and we thank you for coming. And we'll turn it over now to Mr. Terreni, to kind of keep the session going.

MR. TERRENI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we discussed briefly with the parties before you came in the fact that, while no one here has a formal presentation they wish to make, we have a number of folks in the industry, agencies, here, that have indicated a willingness to participate and share their knowledge and expertise with the Commission. If it's okay with the Commission, what I propose to do is to walk through these topics, one by one.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Very good.

MR. TERRENI: And we can go around and solicit questions from you all, and again if there are questions -- not only answers; if you all have questions, we certainly would like to hear about them. So please

let's treat this as as open a discussion as possible. 1 2 I think one thing that might be useful at the 3 outset, since there are not many people here, is if we could all just introduce ourselves, so everybody will 4 know who is who. And we can start right here, sir. 5 I'm Bob Britts. I'm with Southeast 6 MR. BRITTS: 7 RCAP. We're a nonprofit technical-assistance provider for rural utilities. 8 9 MR. TERRENI: Okav. MR. MITCHELL: Mac Mitchell, Utilities, 10 11 Incorporated. 12 MR. WELCH: Richard Welch, South Carolina DHEC, 13 Drinking Water Compliance. Doug Kinard, also South Carolina DHEC. 14 15 MR. BURGESS: Bob Burgess, DHEC, Center for Waste 16 Minimization and Non-Regulatory Assistance Program. MR. FANTRY: And my name is John Fantry. 17 18 private attorney. I work with a lot of nonprofits. 19 Commissioner Hamilton, it's good to see you --20 CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Good to see you, John. 21 MR. FANTRY: -- again. Knew you when you were up in the County. I'm here appearing on behalf of myself 22 23 today. I have no client, but I'm interested in this area and the discussion coming before the Commission. 24 25 CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Thank you.

Jocelyn, some of these folks may not 1 MR. TERRENI: 2 know you. MS. BOYD: I'm Jocelyn Boyd. I'm the Deputy Clerk 3 of the Public Service Commission. 4 MR. MELCHERS: I'm Joseph Melchers. I'm the Chief 5 Counsel to the Commission. 6 7 MR. DONG: I'm Randall Dong. I'm one of the staff lawyers here at the Commission. 8 9 MR. TERRENI: If you could just go through the ones 10 back there. MS. STUTZ: Christina Stutz, Office of Regulatory 11 Staff. 12 13 MS. SEALE: Christina Seale, Office of Regulatory Staff. 14 15 MS. FORD: Elizabeth Ford, Office of Regulatory Staff. 16 MR. MORGAN: Willie Morgan, Office of Regulatory 17 Staff. 18 MS. EDWARDS: Nanette Edwards, Office of Regulatory 19 Staff. 20 MR. BUTLER: David Butler, Senior Counsel to the 21 Commission. 22 MR. PARNELL: Keith Parnell, Bush River Utilities. 23 MR. RICHARDSON: I'm Bill Richardson, with the 24 25 staff.

Jim Spearman, with the Commission 1 DR. SPEARMAN: staff. 2 Keith, would you like to come up here 3 MR. TERRENI: with us? Come on. You don't have to take a test or 4 anything, and it really doesn't cost much more than the 5 6 general admittance. 7 Just before we start, does anybody have any general remarks they'd like to make, or should we proceed -- go 8 9 ahead and proceed? MR. KINARD: Well, just as representative of DHEC 10 here, I wanted to kind of let you know we are here more 11 12 to listen, but also if there are questions that come up 13 about where DHEC -- you know, what our requirements are and where we cover something or where we don't cover 14 15 something, if you all have any questions about where our 16 responsibilities could potentially overlap, we certainly want to be available as a resource to answer that and 17 18 basically to speak on what our regulations might cover. 19 MR. TERRENI: And we appreciate that. There is obviously, you know, the potential for overlap, and it's 20 something that the Commission and staff would like to 21 avoid, and it's important to us to know not only what 22

Mr. Chairman, if we can proceed through the topics

those regulations say, but what you all do with them and

how they work. So, thanks for coming.

23

24

25

-- unless there are any Commissioners --

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: One thing, if I could, Charlie, that I would like to say while we've got this group together, the company rep's, DHEC, and ORS. It's been the goal of the Commission for some time on our water issues, to have a better working relationship between the three agencies that are involved. I know some have responsibility here and others, in it, but I think the more we could operate together and work together -- I think it would make it smoother and better for all of the regulated companies that have to appear before us. And if we kind of knew where we are with the three of us, and I think anything we can do to move forward in that direction would be helpful.

With that, I'll turn it back over to you, Mr. Terreni.

MR. TERRENI: Anybody else on the Commission?
[No response]

MR. TERRENI: The first noticed topic involved recommendations regarding the frequency of inspections, servicing, replacement of infrastructure -- pipes, pumps, et cetera. Just generally speaking, what I would offer is this: You have a public hearing in a case and very frequently customers are saying, "Well, what is this money going for?" You know, and they don't see it,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they don't know it. We don't really have regulations addressing any of these issues. We certainly have accounting reviews. The ORS will come in and make recommendations as to the appropriateness of a rate case. and the Commission will review it, but it's all done on an ad hoc basis.

If we look at things like frequency of inspections, you know, when some -- the obvious -- you know, the obvious reaction from a consumer when there's a sewage backup in his neighborhood is, "They're not doing -they're not inspecting these pipes frequently enough." Well, the answer from the company is, "Well, you never can get it all the time, and we do it," so often, They'll give us a rate, you know, "Ten percent of our pipes every year." There's no -- there is very rarely -- or there is no standard in the Commission's regulations right now as to say, well, how frequent is enough? What is a service protocol? that something that is capable of regulation? So that is what we are getting at, can that be improved? And if any of the Commissioners have any specific comments on -- I think it might be helpful, or questions in this area.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: I would just wonder if any of the companies could maybe share with us what their

company guidelines are.

MR. TERRENI: Or are you familiar with any set of industry guidelines that exist? John?

MR. FANTRY: The interesting thing -- and I'm glad that DHEC is here today -- there are a number of things that I think are in the mix right now, that I would ask the Commission to try and correlate with the safety program and the health requirements of all the water systems and the sewer providers.

Presently right now -- and please correct me; sort of a layperson in the actual operation -- we have mapping systems, which are required to be on the system, to identify where the lines are, their sizes and fittings. There's a sanitary survey that's taken periodically, roundabout every six months or a year -- at least a year -- which talks about what your practices are, looks at your records in regard to some of your water quality testing, and basically is a checklist of what I will call preferred practices that avoid future complications.

The Underground Utilities Siting Act fits in there also, with notification on construction. I believe that ties into the regulations. And so there is a system of performance which you, as Commissioners, might be able to get information on, as to what the standards in the

trade are.

MR. TERRENI: These are DHEC regulations?

MR. FANTRY: These are DHEC regulations for water operators and sewer operators. And best practices. They deal not only with day-to-day operational flows, but I think turning of valves, recommended period for turning of valves, joints. Good things that will avoid -- I'm going to use the word infestation, or pollution of the water.

Some of it even goes into the management and maintenance practices. So I think there can be regulation, but I would encourage that there be -- that you may want to take beyond what those are, but I would encourage it to be the basic -- the basic operating standard to be coordinated.

For example, you talk about maintenance. There's a leak detection program that's required by a water system, where the fact that if you are experiencing some water loss, extraordinary -- anything over 10 percent is considered as nonviable -- anything over 10 percent, you should be out there looking at seeing where this water is not going through your meters, not going to your cash register, where the loss is on that. That also -- well, that just may be one example on it. Perhaps I should really yield the floor here to some of the people that

are actually in the business, because of the tests that are required quarterly, I believe, depending on the size of your system, that's -- so that you can get information on so many taps per area, depending on the size and number of wells you have.

There's a wealth of practices that are out there that could help you in gauging what is appropriate in your hearing procedure and for the rates. And I know that those -- in the rate situation, you're going to hear about what's required by testings and those items, but maybe the preventive maintenance, maybe the customer complaint reporting system is not -- could be increased.

When do you take a line out? We've got water lines in this system that have been put in in the late '40s that are there and have not been changed out. Possibly there's a feeling that it's not broke, don't fix it, but at what point is a line that's been in the ground 50 years just basic good business to wait until it breaks because that's more economical than to find it, to actually stepping over the line to, it's going to break, you know it's going to break, you're just betting against time now? When does it become improper? We don't have that kind of standard in the State.

MR. TERRENI: You don't have a --

MR. FANTRY: It does not exist. And so when we

have large water -- we have water breaks, that's one of the ideas, are you put on notice? Has there been a leak or something out there to do it, or are you just -- you've got a part of your system that's working, and we're going to work it until the bug turns over and dies? That's out there now. I'm going to be quiet for a minute on that point --

MR. TERRENI: You're doing great.

MR. FANTRY: -- because, I mean, that's some of the things that I get calls about from a community, that says, "You know, we had this water line break out there, and, you know, we haven't seen anybody drive the system or take a look or do it, it just -- now we're out of water."

You can have a -- there was a water line break in Lexington County, Town of Lexington, last year, and they didn't know where the master line was to cut it off. It took them three hours to find it because the system maps had not been, you know, brought to speed or -- in about 20 years. And then they rebuilt some of the system, and that did it.

So there's a lot of discussion, with us, and with the nonprofit water companies that I work with, and I think people who are providing water in general, of, you know, have we kept the right records and how are we

doing with that? DHEC does a good job in bringing to the attention of these smaller systems things to be looking at, but most of the time it's, "Well, we don't have enough money to change it over. We can put it off till tomorrow."

MS. BOYD: Well, can I ask DHEC, since John mentioned that your regulations pretty much cover preferred practices, for inspections and servicing, as Charlie mentioned earlier, sometimes in the public hearings the Commission conducts a customers will ask, "You know, the company is asking for all this money. Where's it going? I haven't seen a truck in the neighborhood," so on and so forth. Do your regulations have time periods for, like, inspections, or how often pipes and other things are supposed to be replaced?

MR. KINARD: Well, we don't speak directly to pipe replacement. We do speak to inspections. For, say, a drinking water well system that adds any type of treatment, they have to have a certified operator of appropriate grade to go by every day and check on the chemical feed equipment and everything, make sure it's being dosed correctly, that the chemical feed drums are full, whatnot. If you don't add treatment, someone has to go by and inspect it on a daily basis. So there should be somebody going by each one of these wells

every day. If treatment is added, it needs to be a certified operator; if not, it doesn't necessarily. It could be a maintenance person. But just to make sure everything is running.

In a wastewater treatment facility, we require that a certified operator of appropriate grade also go by there once a day.

MS. BOYD: Well, let me ask you something else, because -- are there areas of your regulations -- we haven't discussed just putting, you know -- it might -- this might already be in our water and wastewater reg's, but that the companies are to comply with -- let's just take the first issue here -- inspections, servicing, and replacements in accordance with DHEC regulation. Is there anything you would change about your existing regulations? I know we're always looking at ours and trying to modify them, you know. Is there something that you would, instead of us just accepting them in total, say, "Well, maybe you all might want to look at tweaking this or that a little bit"?

MR. KINARD: Our reg's are almost exclusively going to be -- especially on the drinking water side -- and it's easier to talk about that. That's one of the ones -- I mean, you know, the wastewater plants -- well, I don't know what the difference is in the number of

complaints you get. I assume that a lot of them have to do water quality and drinking water quality.

But on that matter, a lot of what we do is federally mandated. We do have a pretty comprehensive set of regulations about design standards and what people have to do to properly operate and maintain. Mr Fantry mentioned some of our programs that we require, leak detection, flushing programs, all this. But it's mostly going to be guided toward public health protection, maybe not service or aesthetic issues like smell, taste and odor.

I mean, we certainly respond to those kind of complaints because we have to determine is this something that's potentially linked to a health issue. I mean, if you have water that doesn't smell right, maybe it's just, you know, a lake turnover -- if it's City of Columbia -- or maybe it's iron and manganese in a smaller well system. But we always investigate those, but unless it's just a really, I guess, a terrible problem in that area, we don't have the teeth to make somebody make their water taste better, I guess is what -- I mean, we certainly -- as long as it's safe, we will recommend all the things that they can do to improve that, end flushing is one of the -- you know, aggressive flushing we think, just a normal, routine flushing of

the system will prevent a lot of these problems, and we do require a flushing program. But you know, sometimes it may not -- it may need to be changed or it may need to be done more routinely than it is.

MS. BOYD: Would brown water -- somebody's -- the color, because you said you don't govern or regulate aesthetic issues -- somebody's brown water get your attention, though? I mean, would that --

MR. KINARD: It gets our attention. We respond.

But that, in and of itself, does not constitute a

violation of DHEC regulations.

MS. BOYD: Oh, okay.

MR. WELCH: I wanted to respond to something you asked a minute ago. You said a lot of times somebody will come in and say, well, maybe their bill -- a customer says, "Well, our bill from our water provider says DHEC fees." A lot of that is the fee that we charge to recover the cost of doing some of their sampling. So like Doug said, if somebody brings a jar of brown water, the first thing that will happen, our regional office will go pull a sample, a bacteriological sample and things like that.

So there are fees that we charge each water system, based on the number of taps. A lot of that is directly related back to the cost of pulling samples and having

the water samples analyzed for federally defined parameters. I don't know if any of our program is implemented based on that.

But specific to infrastructure, because of the pipes being under the ground, I mean, you can't go out there and dig up with a shovel every mile of pipeline, but we do regulate the water valves and hydrants, Mr. Fantry mentioned. Hydrants are every three years, they have to be inspected. And if they find a bad one, we're not the ones telling them, "Hey, you have to replace this." We would kind of leave that up to their own common sense that, "If I don't replace it, I'm going to have a problem."

He also mentioned a lot of times, because of growth in certain areas -- as y'all know, South Carolina's growth is exploding exponentially in some areas -- the maps aren't catching up, and the documentation and some of the permitted drawings aren't catching up. Or a road is widened and a valve is buried, and that's why it takes three and four hours to find some of these things. And we don't regulate that, outside of making them exercise their valves, you know, on a schedule.

MR. KINARD: Another thing I just wanted to throw out there is, I really hope -- with DHEC being here, we certainly don't want to stifle any conversations, you

know, from the water systems about, you know, what their practices are or anything. I mean, we -- so, I mean, if we find -- if you all feel like, you know, we're kind of inhibiting that, we'll be happy to either get up and leave or plug our ears or whatever. I mean, in other words, I would like for the water systems to feel free to kind of give their perspective, without worrying about whether or not DHEC is listening and taking notes, because we won't. I mean, I promise you, we're not going to be chasing after you after you leave and trying to track you down.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: I join with that, and we reiterate that this is just an open work session. No one is under oath. And it's just for the Commission's information, and the final result will affect the companies, so I would hope, too, that they will speak their piece today.

COMMISSIONER FLEMING: I'd like to ask a question about your best practices, as far as keeping the sewer lines clean. We hear a lot about tree roots blocking sewer lines, and I know, you know, some cities have a rule that they clean their lines out one to two years, depending on the area, and then we hear other companies have a different one, like once every ten years. Do you have a set of what the best practices are, of keeping

sewer lines clean?

MR. KINARD: Well, I'm a little bit at a disadvantage in that Rich and I both -- our background is in drinking water, mostly, and I know probably the smaller the sewer line, the harder it is, probably, to keep clean, would be my guess. Certainly harder to keep unplugged. And I would ask some of the folks here with the systems what they think. Their opinion would certainly be more knowledgeable than mine.

MS. BOYD: Mr. Parnell?

MR. TERRENI: Yeah.

MR. PARNELL: From what I understand, over at DHEC --

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Let us get a mic for you, so all of us can hear you.

MR. PARNELL: Okay. From what I can understand, the federal government has -- they're issuing new rules, and it's called CMOMs, which is supposedly -- I don't believe the State has got it in full effect yet, but supposedly it's going to outline the maintenance and -- all the maintenance issues in a collection system and pumping system, for all type of utilities in wastewater. But I've heard about the CMOMs coming down the pike for several years, but haven't -- I don't think DHEC has really set a program up for it yet.

MR. KINARD: It does exist in -- it's a federal program. EPA pushed, I guess is what you'd call it -- it's not mandated at this point. It stands for Comprehensive -- I think it's Comprehensive Maintenance Operation and Management, and it does deal specifically with collection systems. And at this point, on some occasions where we've had inflow and infiltration problems into sewer lines that have caused overflows either at manholes or even overwhelmed the treatment plants, we have required the CMOM evaluation as part of an enforcement order against a utility, if we know or suspect that that's what's causing the problem.

It is -- it's sort of best management practices for sewer systems. I'm not extremely familiar with it, but I know about the concept and I know there's documentation out there, both on EPA's website and I believe we have some information on ours, as well, that outlines what's involved.

COMMISSIONER FLEMING: And I'd like for you to talk a little bit about where -- going back to what Mr.

Terreni was talking about earlier -- areas where we do overlap. Could you -- where DHEC overlaps with the Public Service Commission.

MR. KINARD: Well, I mean, anybody can jump in.

Certainly, ORS -- we work closely with them on some

projects. A lot of times, where we find that we have water quality issues, especially smaller systems, there's also a service issue. Of course, we deal with both public and private, so we have a little bit bigger universe to deal with. But there are several projects we've worked with ORS where not only have we been concerned about water quality, but whether or not the system will actually continue to be able to serve their customers.

So I would say, you know, we end up with a lot of the same folks that -- where we get complaints, we're going to assume that the PSC -- those are the same systems you all will get complaints about. So we overlap on just about every one where there seems to be problems. So again, we respond to different issues but we respond, both, to the same complaints.

COMMISSIONER FLEMING: Are there any areas where the regulations contradict each other, that we could work together to make them more compatible, to help each other?

MR. KINARD: Well, I'm not incredibly familiar with all of your regulations. I don't think there are -- we've never come across a situation where we felt like we were directly conflicting with PSC on water quality or issues like that, certainly.

MR. FANTRY: Commissioner Fleming, could I jump in here to do two things? One, as a former town attorney of a small town that had its own sewer operation, I might just reflect on what we experienced there, you know. And that was that our system that had been put in the ground in the early '30s -- and it's a small town and really hadn't changed much -- had experienced some tree growth in the area, some undersizing, water infiltration, as more pavement and things were turned around. And it's a dollar issue for them, because while there are many grants or applications for reduced funding that's applicable for building a system, the systems -- the retrofitting of them is not there in the process right now.

So you can't go to Farmers Home, which was the primary source, and get money to redo something because you should have -- should have -- been putting money aside to take care of that maintenance, but the smaller communities will do -- we're not going to raise rates to do that.

Some of the issues that come out of this is the change from a DHEC regulation, which is addressing health, and I think I heard clearly -- and I agree with it -- that, you know, there's a difference between doing something because of a health matter, safety, and

whether or not it's economically feasible to do it. So whereas the Commission is looking at the rates and those abilities and may say, "Well, based on what you have spent, we're going to build that into your rate," DHEC is often faced with the unpleasant saying, "We really understand that there's not money to do it, but it's a health issue. Get it. You're under order to get it."

So we're doing this balancing act. So if there is conflict in it, from the standpoint of the persons that you would regulate, there's a lot of pressure on them from time to time to deal with health matters that have to be built into the rate, and you are going to get that request, and you're going to have the smaller systems that are limping along with rates that are adequate, trying to build up and meet some of these things, to some points where they are financially distressed and will come in and say, "You know, what can we do, you know, other than this upgrade? What can we do, other than making -- modernizing our maps, we'll do it next year, you know. Let us keep working on it."

MR. TERRENI: Just following up on that, John, I mean, the conundrum on the Commission's side is, it's one thing to pay top dollar -- to have consumers that are paying top dollar sometimes for good service and good quality water. You know, the prices are what they

are. They may not be happy with them, but at least they don't have those issues. It's quite another thing to have consumers paying top dollar, or any price for -- because they're going to always consider it top dollar under these circumstances -- when the service isn't good, and the response isn't good, or there are a lot of problems in the system.

So you're saying, you know, the utility is being -pulling one way, saying, "I've got to address these DHEC
regulations." Well, certainly, they're mandatory and
they have got to be built into the rate base. But on
the other side of the coin, the customers are going to
be far less accepting of that rate increase if their
sewers are backing up, you know, on the golf course or
in the backyard, because the lines haven't been
maintained on a regular schedule.

And the Commission finds itself saying at what point do we factor what you're getting for your money into the rate decision, and how do we do that? And it's asked to do that, I think, in various ways, in just almost every case, and this is part of the deliberation. Is there some way to just lay that out, you know, in a rule, that gives everybody some guidance and says this is what we're going to be looking at and this is how we're going to look at it?

And also, part of that that DHEC, I think, might be able to help us with is, is there data already out there being reported to DHEC for health and safety reasons, primarily, that could guide us in making those other determinations?

MR. KINARD: Well, we do a lot of monitoring on public water systems. Again, part of the fee system Rich mentioned a little while ago, we test for almost a hundred different contaminants in every water system at some point on some frequency. We do bacteriological monitoring -- well, the systems do it monthly and they report to us. So we have a lot of information.

Now turning that into what's the water quality out here, you know, into some type of formula, numeric type thing, might be difficult. Like we score restaurants, I mean, A to C or whatever. You know, that might be very difficult. I know that would be extremely difficult to do.

MR. TERRENI: Right.

MR. KINARD: One thing you mentioned -- actually where we see the most problems with systems that aren't able to provide service, it's a lot of times I think been that they collected money over time but didn't plan for the future very well. I mean, I know this may be an area where I don't know -- I don't want to go in any

direction that's not appropriate, but I know that the whole issue of not being able to have a capital improvement fund has been an issue.

And we have seen that before, where they have to pay for something and then recoup the money through rates, a lot of people are running on that thin edge and just aren't able to do it, and they do let things go. So, I mean, that's just one issue. I don't necessarily want to get too far into that or into a debate about it, or anything. But not planning well and having a reserve fund really taxes the ability of some of these systems to respond when something really, really pricey breaks.

MR. TERRENI: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Let me ask you one question.

On your website, is there availability to check the water quality of different companies? DHEC warnings, DHEC fines, et cetera?

MR. KINARD: We don't publish fines on our website.

Actually, you can go through the EPA website and get

water quality information on any public water system in
the nation.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: In the State? Okay.

MR. KINARD: We have an annual water quality report that we produce that anyone can have access, can download it. Or I think we'll even provide hardcopies,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if necessary. But it will outline every violation of any drinking water standard for -- you know, it's an annual report of all the water systems in the State.

**COMMISSIONER WRIGHT:** Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Yes, sir. Commissioner Wright.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I think I've got a follow-up on a couple of things, so pardon me if a ramble just a second, but to address the capital improvement fund, the concept, okay, there are, I believe, Butch -- I believe maybe there's some federal programs or maybe there's some things that we're not able to tap into in South Carolina, and I really think it probably is addressed more if somebody wants to merge or to buy a system out. You know, you've got the old plant in-ground, you know, and it's kind of cost prohibitive, and they're looking for some kind of incentive to come in and do the purchase, and maybe there's a way where existing companies can improve their systems, too, with that, but I don't think we have the ability, from legislative authority, to do that. So, one thing I think that we'd want to look at while we're talking about this is, is there something that would need to be addressed legislatively that we could recommend, that would help things such as a capital improvement program.

Second point that I wanted to mention was if, in a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

rate case, we hear customer complaints about not just water quality -- which is another question of how do you define that -- but they say they're not spending the money the way they said they were going to do it, and, you know, possibly they're not. I don't know that. do we need to look at possibly, when somebody is looking at bringing a rate case forward, earmarking a certain amount of money in a pot for capital improvements to replace existing plant in-ground or aged plant inground, so that you would get that yearly percentage of upgrade or five years, or whatever it is, so that the money is being spent, guaranteed it's being spent, rather than granting a rate case but you don't know whether or not it's going to happen, until the next case is brought forward. Any thought or comment on that?

MR. KINARD: Well, the first program I think you're referring to is the State revolving loan fund program, which we do have restrictions on it being loaned to private companies. I'm not sure exactly why that is, whether it's just some decision that was made somewhere or if it's actual legislation that was passed. But we do have that restriction.

On the second part, talking about the theory of the capital improvement fund, I mean, certainly I think the Commission would want some way to make sure the money is

being spent on capital improvements and not just bottom line, you know, profit back to the company. Certainly there would have to be something in place to do that. But most of -- just about all of our municipal systems, not all of them, do have some type of mechanism in place to save up money for replacement cost. And that's -- we highly recommend that.

Actually, I think in Florida, it's required. The State of Florida requires a certain amount of money to be set aside to replace equipment that fails, so they have to have one. So, depending on -- you know, again, there's a lot of complications with it, I'm sure, but again, with our public utilities, where they can, we highly recommend that.

MR. FANTRY: Commissioner Wright --

**COMMISSIONER WRIGHT:** Yes.

MR. FANTRY: -- one thing I think was excellent that you said, if I were doing a rate hearing, I would like to know if they were meeting their sanitary survey, I'd like to know if there have been complaints from the system, and I'd like to know if they have adequately maintained the system, which would be done by violations. And I think that's what a town -- the town councils are doing when they are trying to adjust their rates. So you have a different perspective for those

companies that you are regulating, in getting that information. I think -- this is only personal. I think that would be appropriate, when you do it. And looking at whether or not there is a fund set aside for replacement. Depreciation is not often used -- those dollars that come back are not often used to replace those items.

The Budget and Control Board fund in the private sector for for-profit corporations would have to be routed through a governmental body, because it's a bond to entities, and they can't receive them. So there are counties who could help a system out in the community by -- Mr. Hamilton, I think you did it when you were on council. But it's very tight and the money has to be shown to be replacing a crisis item or dealing with something that would be health related, so that it does not go to profit.

The mechanisms for a regulated system are -- I mean, they only have the rates to go through it, or borrow the money and then come back and try to get it through the rates. And developer systems will either be -- once it's built out and they become homeowners association things, you know, seems to be probably where a lot of the problem is, because they just want to plan for today, cost of today, let tomorrow worry. And they

may not come in for a rate increase. You may not get to 1 2 hear the condition of their system because --3 MR. TERRENI: In most cases, we don't hear --MR. FANTRY: -- they'll let it go 15 years -- you 4 know, 15 years, and then they're in crisis mode, and 5 they come in and say, "You know, we had to spend a 6 7 million dollars, we had to do this and that, and what will you give me to replace it?" 8 9 MR. TERRENI: And if it's a homeowners association, 10 we're not going to regulate them. 11 MR. FANTRY: Because they've requested the 12 exemption. MR. TERRENI: Yeah. 13 MR. FANTRY: Yeah. 14 15 MR. TERRENI: So we may not even see those systems. 16 COMMISSIONER HOWARD: Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Yes, sir. Commissioner Howard. 17 18 **COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** To follow up on Commissioner 19 Wright, and I think where the conversation is going, 20 several states have a mechanism in place called DISC, which stands for Distribution System Improvement Charge 21 or -- but basically the way that works, and I think 22 23 Pennsylvania has probably been the state that's most successful with it, is there's a line item on the 24 25 customer's bill each month, a percentage, and I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the typical percentage thrown around -- and Mr. Morgan has sat on several meetings with me where this was discussed -- but the percentage generally thrown around is 3 percent and it's added to the customer's bill each month, and that charge has to be used for improvements in infrastructure. It can't be used for any capital improvements, just infrastructure improvements. I'd like to comment on that system. I think Pennsylvania recently raised theirs, through some controversy, and Pennsylvania is now 5-1/2 percent. anyway, the range is anywhere, I guess, from 2 percent to 5-1/2 -- 7-1/2 percent. I'm sorry. But I'd like any comments on that. Is that something that should be looked at, at whatever level looks into these things, or if anybody has had any experience with that surcharge.

[No response]

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Don't all speak at one time.

MR. KINARD: I'm actually unfamiliar with that program. I haven't seen that before.

commissioner wright: Well, I guess the purpose of it, obviously, you know, you've got systems that are 50, 75 years old in the ground, pipe in the ground. And I mean, we were even in New York the other week, and they still have water coming through wooden pipes up there. But anyway, that surcharge that he's talking about is

exactly -- that's exactly what I was talking about. And I don't know that we have authority here to do that yet, but that's kind of what I was suggesting. You know, there may be some things legislatively that we need to think outside the box on, to see if there are ways that we can help with averting some of these problems or being a little bit more proactive rather than them getting to a crisis mode and come to us for some type of relief.

COMMISSIONER FLEMING: I want to -- if I could go back to the water. You say you have engineers, or the companies check the water daily, so that they know that the quality of the water is safe for drinking. And so how does that work? Do they notify you if it's not safe? And if it's not safe, do they have a certain time limit to notify the customers? How does that system work?

MR. WELCH: Typically, as Doug mentioned -- well, the largest systems are the surface water, the most complicated. They take numerous measurements per day, different tests, and they report to us at the end of the month. That's the federal requirement. They send us a 15-page report, and we have compliance officers and an engineering staff to review that, to make sure it's in parameters.

Most of the time, if they fall out of one of those they will call us and tell us. Not always. A lot of times we don't know if something happened at the beginning of the month until we review it the following month. That happened recently. We called the system in. We had some words with them. You know, so that kind of ironed out.

The smaller systems, small groundwater systems, right now there is no requirement that they submit anything to us, outside of their monthly bacteriologicals, as Doug mentioned. There is a new federal regulation that will go into effect within the next couple of years that will erase some of that, and they will also have to report to us.

So there are mechanisms in place. If there is some kind of problem, we would expect that they would notify us. I don't know that that's anywhere in the regulations that they -- it depends on what it is.

Certainly, line breaks, if they issue a water notice, they send us a copy, and then to all --

**COMMISSIONER FLEMING:** And do they have a time frame for notifying the customers.

MR. WELCH: It depends on what it is. If it's a serious health issue, it's usually right way. As soon as possible, but no less than 24 hours, I think -- is

that the way it --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. KINARD: Well, that's with any type of acute --

No greater than 24. MR. WELCH:

MR. KINARD: Yeah. Any type of acute -- like if they found bacteria in the water, which we use -- total coliform is our indicator organism that we use to determine whether or not there's potentially any bacteria, which in and of itself is not dangerous, but it's kind of just an indicator, a relatively quick test, that's inexpensive to run. And all these community water systems, which is all, I guess, you all would be dealing with, they have to do that on a monthly basis, depending on size as to how many samples they take. They don't necessarily take a bacteria sample every day. But if they add treatment, they'll take, say, a pH sample and chlorine residual sample every day, which that is something that would be kind of an indicator of if something was wrong. And, yes, they should notify us right away if they find any serious problems. find a bacteriological problem in their system where they're going to have them exceeding a maximum contaminant level, they're supposed to let us know that.

their daily check?

24

MR. KINARD: Right. Well, they would know whether

**COMMISSIONER FLEMING**: And they would know that on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or not they've had -- they wouldn't necessarily know if they'd had a total coliform MCL excedence, because they don't take those every day, but, say if they ran out of chlorine and they're not getting a residual in the water, they would know about that, and that would indicate that they need to do something to correct the problem.

I wanted to mention, too, the word MR. WELCH: "sanitary survey" has been thrown around today. know if everybody is familiar with what that is, but with drinking water, that's a federally defined inspection of the drinking water facilities, to include distribution system. They're required every three years by EPA, but DHEC has a goal set of every year on a community water system. And so on the larger facilities, larger surface water plants and even the larger groundwater, we sit down with them, a DHEC inspector goes out, goes through regulations with them, reviews their plant, reviews their records, monitoring records that they've submitted to us. A lot of times, if we get something on one of those monthly reports I mentioned, the parameter might be a little bit out of line but it's not a public health issue, or they're calculating something wrong but it's not that big of a concern healthwise, we would kind of go over that stuff

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with them at that yearly inspection. That is our target, and I think we're kind of ahead of the game, as far as other states go. I don't know -- we're one of the few that do that, as far as I know.

MR. MELCHERS: Mr. Kinard, you had mentioned aesthetic standards. Are those the -- how do you define those? Are those secondary maximum contaminant levels set by the feds?

MR. KINARD: Generally. That's what we would consider an aesthetic standard. Sometimes -- I mean, there are some things -- well, you do have odor, I guess, is in there. Sometimes water will have an altered taste, but you don't have a standard for altered taste but you know it when you see it. So, I mean, those are the kind of things -- and again, we do investigate those, just to make sure it's not coming from anything that could potentially be a health issue, but a lot of times if it's not -- and a lot of times we'll figure out what it is. Iron is one of the ones where -- that's brown water. Iron and manganese, that's brown iron, dirty water, you know. We'll get that sometimes. And sulfur dioxides and other things, we -rotten egg odor, in some well systems we'll run across that here and there. And again, it's something we encourage the water systems to fix, but we don't have a

1	standard we can take them into say an enforcement action
2	against them and make them do it, unless it's just
3	completely to the point that it's unusable. If the
4	water is unusable, we would take an action on a
5	secondary maximum contaminant level.
6	MR. TERRENI: Are there recommended levels for
7	these contaminants?
8	MR. KINARD: Well, that's the secondary maximum
9	contaminant levels are, for lack of a better word,
10	recommendations on iron, manganese iron, is it .1,
11	and manganese is .03 milligrams per liter.
12	MR. TERRENI: But did I just hear you say that you
13	could be within those levels and still have
14	MR. KINARD: Yes.
15	MR. TERRENI: poor aesthetics?
16	MR. KINARD: It could be noticeable.
17	MR. TERRENI: Okay.
18	MR. MELCHERS: Even if you're outside those levels,
19	what does DHEC do about it?
20	MR. KINARD: Again, it's something where we'll
21	encourage them to add treatment. If it's a new system,
22	sometimes we might would require treatment if it's
23	enough above that that we feel like it's not going to be
24	something that's even usable as a water source. So we
25	have required treatment on secondary maximum contaminant

levels, but going in and enforcing those, if we were 1 taken to court on it, it might be a little bit 2 difficult. 3 MR. TERRENI: But they're measured, in any case. 4 MR. KINARD: Yes. 5 MR. TERRENI: And if you've got a public system out 6 7 there, it should be measured. MR. MELCHERS: How frequently are MCLs measured? 8 9 Is it according to the size of the system? 10 MR. KINARD: Right, and the contaminant. We have -- a lot of the chemical contaminants, which are a lot 11 12 of them, shouldn't be in the water, ever. I mean, it's things -- pesticides, things like that -- that you 13 wouldn't expect to find in a water system. We do a 14 15 round of sampling every quarter for a year, and if you don't hit it, you go to a every-three-year cycle; but if 16 you hit it, you go back to the every-three-month cycle. 17 18 It's a lot of complicated ways to make that 19 determination. The ones that are most often taken are the bacteria 20 samples, which are every month for most any system --21 any community system, they have to do that every month. 22 23 And if they add chlorine, then chlorine residuals are usually taken daily, and pH readings, things like that. 24

But

So -- disinfection byproducts are taken quarterly.

25

again, if we don't find that at certain levels, you can go to a less frequent sampling.

MR. MELCHERS: Why were the secondary MCLs set, in the first place? What was the governmental purpose behind even setting those standards?

MR. KINARD: That's a good question. They were there when I started in '91, and they've always been there, so I'm not really -- I know the EPA wanted to set some standards for aesthetics, but I think it even says specifically in their literature they're non-enforceable standards.

MR. WELCH: I think it gets back to what you were saying earlier. If you're within the maximum contaminant level, that's the maximum allowable, with a safety factor. Over that, you start getting into health problems. Like fluoridation, that's been a big issue. If you're over the MCL of four, that's -- as you get six and eight and higher, that's a big deal. If you're under that, well, healthwise it's not the best situation, so let's set a level lower than that, that if you maintain that then you're always in a good health situation up to that secondary. As you get above the secondary approaching the maximum contaminant level, some of those things -- color is another one. The color standard -- there is no maximum on it, but the secondary

-- as you get above that, you start getting into brown water, more and more brown water, it may have a little tinge to it at the secondary, which isn't that big of a deal. Certainly, you don't want to drink muddy water. It may not be harmful for you, but it certainly --

MR. KINARD: Actually, fluoride is a very good example, because you have both the primary and secondary MCL. The secondary -- between -- that is set based on actual pitting of the enamel on your teeth and molting of your teeth. I mean, at the secondary, that can happen if you drink enough of it. But after it gets to the primary, EPA says there actually could be adverse health effects, not just cosmetic, you know, of your teeth not looking good. So that's kind of a really good example of the difference between a primary and secondary standard.

MR. FANTRY: If I might, here, to answer your question Mr. Terreni, that EPA -- why did they back away from aesthetics. As a member of the National Rural Water Association for about 20 years, there are a lot of systems -- not so much in South Carolina, but around the country, that we're talking about 50 to 100 to 150 users on it, and while they're addressing the health needs, when you get into too much aesthetics or you get into best practices and get into those items, that you're

making water unaffordable. And on the national level before EPA, that has been a big battle, how extensive the testing should be in relationship to a New York City, and on one- or two-well systems that may have 300 customers on it.

And so where South Carolina is a state that has accepted the EPA responsibility for enforcement -- if I remember how that goes -- to apply those laws, and has the ability to exceed those in their own jurisdiction, it's, again, the politics of how much is enough. So I think, you know, the EPA does the same thing. We're not going to go into how beautiful, how tasteful, your water is going to be, because it's just too darned expensive for the technology and the science that's before us today.

MR. WELCH: That's another distinction, too. The EPA federal regulations are written to cover nationwide. We may have pockets of elevated fluoride here in South Carolina, or uranium -- everybody's heard of that up in the Simpsonville area, of radionuclides. Well, they set a national regulation to cover nationwide, and as Mr. Fantry said, we may have different -- different cond- -- we do, we have different conditions here in South Carolina than other states have to deal with, so that's part of it.

MR. MELCHERS: I guess the reason that I'm going into that inquiry about secondary MCLs is, would DHEC consider that an appropriate aesthetic standard? As I understand your discussion about aesthetics, what came to mind were those secondary MCLs, and I'm curious, is that how you define aesthetic standards or are there other standards that we might look to in addition to that?

MR. KINARD: Well, there are some aesthetic problems not caused by secondary -- maximum contaminant levels and secondary contaminant. I think in some instances you can have water above the secondary MCL that's not necessarily aesthetically unpleasing. I mean, some of it, you know, it's possible. We've seen above secondary MCL where people -- we've not even had complaints about it. Not really sure what the -- you know, maybe they're used to it or maybe they've always had it.

We have a big problem in groundwater with iron and manganese in the State -- I mean, certain parts of it.

The other part of it is it's expensive to treat. If you don't add treatment -- the most expensive thing is, once you add treatment, you have to have daily operator visits by a certified operator, which that is something that throws you into a whole different cost dynamic

there.

But to get -- I really can't answer, but I know I'm kind of dancing around a little bit, but it's a difficult question. It's really a case-by-case basis, and you know, we have folks who are supersensitive to chlorine and to them, the amount we put in there to protect public health is objectionable. So aesthetically, they're not happy with their water aesthetically, but we regulate that it be that way, so it's kind of -- it's really a case-by-case basis.

MR. MELCHERS: And that would be driven by the local water conditions, when you say it's case-by-case?

MR. KINARD: Yes.

MR. MELCHERS: Thanks, very much.

MR. TERRENI: But at the same time, the answer could be, "We have this secondary MCL and we recognize that it's excessive, Public Service Commission, but the cost of treatment would be this much, and in our judgment that's more than the customer base can bear," and the Commissioner might really just have to make that decision. And at least when the consumers are saying, "Hey, I've got water I can't wash my clothes in," if the Commission has got a finding that says, well, we recognize that's true, and however unfortunate it is, we don't think you want your rates increased by another 25

percent to cure that situation, at least there's an informed decision about it. And maybe they come back and say, "Yeah, we do." You know, I mean the difficulty right now is the discussion never gets beyond, "My water stinks," or, "I can't wash my clothes," or, "I can't drink it," and the Commission is left with what you are saying is, are these people hypersensitive or is it just not a good deal or -- you know.

MR. KINARD: If we get a complaint and we investigate it, I mean, we're more than willing, upon request, to share that information with the Commission, if we have some sample results or anything that says it's above a certain level. That's probably the information you're lacking is, they say the water stinks. We may know why. But I mean, you probably are not given that information, because they're not going to just volunteer, "Oh, we got iron, you know, in excess of secondary maximum contaminant level. That's why that smells and they don't like it."

MR. TERRENI: Yeah.

MR. KINARD: Yeah.

MR. WELCH: I'd like to respond, too, to your question a second ago about whether those are -- whether DHEC would consider them acceptable standards. A lot of times we defer back to EPA. They set that level based

on university research, based on consultant research. There is a National American Water Works Association that's actually international. They've done research nationwide, they sponsor projects that are individual water systems. So a lot of our judgments or determinations or interpretations are based on some of the research that's been done, scientific research.

So where somebody might say, "My water stinks, my hair is all falling out because of it," we would have or we could hopefully find some kind of scientific evidence to either refute that or uphold that.

COMMISSIONER HOWARD: I have a question. Just a rough guess, what percentage of the public's water systems have some type of filtration or treatment prior to entering into the distribution stream?

MR. KINARD: You mean the whole universe, or just privates, or just --

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD**: Well, either one. I was thinking, in particular, public, but private or -- either one, really.

MR. KINARD: I'd say treatment, probably -- the entire universe -- if we take the State water system into account, which are very, very small water systems -- you probably are at 60 percent. If you go to the community water systems, which basically serve homes,

not just businesses but homes, you're probably closer to 75 to 80 percent add some sort of treatment. And that is a really rough guess.

commissioner Howard: I understand. Let me ask one other question on a different subject, following up, again, on Commissioner Wright, talking about large companies or companies using take-over or merger or buying a smaller company. And one of the mechanisms used by some states is a forgiveness clause of fines that might have been acquired or accumulated by the nonviable company or the company being taken over. Do you all have a forgiveness clause on that?

MR. KINARD: We don't call it that, but we -- when we have enforcement actions against individual water systems, if they have agreed to connect to a larger water system, basically, if they're nonviable and have said, "We don't really want to be in the water business anymore; we want to turn our system over to this municipal system or somebody else," we'll do what we call stipulate the penalties, in other words, "Do this, tie on, and as long as you do all that, you don't have to pay the penalty." We use that fairly frequently, especially for the drinking water program.

**COMMISSIONER WRIGHT**: Do you do that with the private-to-private sale or merger?

MR. KINARD: I can't remember that occurrence, but we wouldn't -- we would not distinguish between whether it's private or public entities doing it, as long as it's another approved public water system.

COMMISSIONER MITCHELL: Could you just speak to me just a little bit about the water pressure? We've heard that discussed a lot of times before us in hearings. Is it argued that a certain pressure is the right amount of pressure, or as you talked on several occasions about small water systems, large water systems? Is there a standard, should there be a standard, or should one standard apply to all?

MR. KINARD: Well, we have a standard of 25 pounds per square inch at the connection, each connection. It can go as low as 20 during heavy flows or fire flow. That's the DHEC standard. And that's basically intended, again, not as a service issue but to maintain positive pressure so that you don't have any type of backflow into the water system. So that is a -- we look at it as a health-based standard, with a factor of safety included there.

But to answer what I think your question is, should we have a minimum for service --

commissioner mitchell: Right, that's where I'm getting at. I mean, if the company would like to

respond too, any of the companies. We've just heard that argued a lot. You know, you get in a water hearing, "I don't have enough pressure." "I've got too much pressure." And I understand the problem with the older lines, that that can be a significant problem if you're thrusting a lot of pressure in there.

I just wonder, has anybody here, you know, got anything they would like to contribute along that line that might help the Commission when we get involved in certain cases like that, especially approving any funds for that. Or maybe on the company line, I know we have some company people here. Certainly, I would like to hear what they have to say about if they've got any suggestions, or they think it's fine like it is.

MR. KINARD: Commissioner, most people aren't satisfied with 25 pounds, I can tell you that.

**COMMISSIONER MITCHELL**: I can assure you they're not. Yeah.

MR. KINARD: They're not happy if that's what they have.

commissioner mitchell: So I guess what I'm asking is, what suggestion do you all have to try to work around that problem? Because I can assure you when we have any hearing anywhere, pressure is going to come up. Quality of water, but pressure's going to be there too.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I understand all the different circumstances.

MR. FANTRY: If I can break your pressure question into two areas --

**COMMISSIONER MITCHELL**: Okay.

MR. FANTRY: -- one is that my experience with pressure questions has been fire flow and the size of line for fire flow. And from the perspective of water companies that I have worked with, which are many of the nonprofits, that the lines were built for water flow, not fire flow. Funding was not available for fire flow. So you have many of the small -- some systems that either didn't put it in, or they put in on very sparing levels. And there has been for a number of years -- at least five that I'm aware of -- real discussions between the volunteer fire departments and the fire agencies in this State, as trying to require fire flow on the construction of lines as being a requirement of water service. And that's a new jump. And, which, many of my small systems say we can't -- you know, we're not in the business to provide fire flow. We were here to provide the water. And if you're going to do fire flow, then we need to go to the counties or go to -- you know, to supplement that area.

COMMISSIONER MITCHELL: Yeah, and I appreciate it, because that certainly is an issue on insurance issues

and you will hear that mentioned along with the infrastructure issues that were brought up by the other Commissioners there, is, what comes first. I know that's always -- in the eight to nine years I've been on the Commission -- should the company bill first and then come to the Commission with the bill, or should we approve funds prior to building the infrastructure to keep up? That and pressure issues is what I've always heard since I've been here, and I appreciate all y'all contributing. So far it's been very helpful.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: It certainly has.

MR. TERRENI: One of the topics that was noticed involved the utilities' response time and resolution of disturbance of customer property due to utility repair work. Basically, when something goes wrong, what are the response times. And one thing I would offer to you all is that we currently have a regulation in place that requires a company to report a citation by DHEC of a violation of DHEC regulations involving -- I think the language we have is a serious -- or, affecting customer services. And I wonder if you all could walk us through the DHEC enforcement process, so that we could figure out if maybe that's the right place to require this kind of reporting. Also we've run into, obviously, differing interpretations of what affects customer service, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

perhaps it's a better pressure point for the Commission to obtain information that would be pertinent.

MR. KINARD: So you're wanting --

MR. TERRENI: If you could tell us, how does it work. You know, if I have a sewage spill, is there a citation or is there a report? Where do we go?

MR. KINARD: Especially on the wastewater side, with the example you used, technically, any unauthorized discharge of sewage into the environment is a violation. All right. Now, if it is responded to in a timely manner and cleaned up to our satisfaction, it's not generally going to result in an enforcement action. mean, that's a responsive reaction. Now, if it's allowed to continue to occur or, say, it even stops but it's not cleaned up or there's no response, we would -potentially, that would lead to an escalating set of enforcement actions. You would get a Notice of Violation. You may get a Notice of Enforcement Conference, so that they would come in and we actually sit around the table and they explain to us -- the water -- sewer system sits there and explains to us what happened, you know, why did it happen, you know, and we discuss whether or not we need to go further with a consent order, which that is kind of the next step up the line if we feel like it deserves more than just a

Notice of Violation, if it deserves some corrective action, then potentially a penalty will enter into it, or we'll attempt to enter into a consent order with the system where we'll send them something saying, "Here's what we want you to do. We'd like for you to agree to it and potentially pay this amount of money as a civil penalty." At that point, they can either say, "We want to negotiate parts of it," or, "We don't want to," and if it gets to a point where we can't come to an agreement, we'll issue an administrative order, which is basically, "This is what we're telling you you have to do and this is the penalty you have to pay," which is generally higher than if they consent.

MR. TERRENI: Right.

MR. KINARD: And at that point it enters into the administrative processes as far as appeals and things. But that's just in a nutshell how we do it.

MR. TERRENI: You said something about response time. Is there a criteria for evaluating response time, or is that a subjective decision?

MR. KINARD: It's subjective. I mean, there are a lot of things that factor into it, the immediacy of the problem, whether or not it's something that's -- if it's potentially going to affect -- if there are children playing out in the spill, that kind of thing, you know,

there's just different degrees of how fast you need to be there to correct these problems. A small leak versus a line break would be an example.

## MR. TERRENI: Commissioners?

commissioner clyburn: I noticed we -- one of my interests was item number two, in terms of response and resolution of complaints. I don't know if this is where some of the companies might chime in. And I won't mention a particular case, but that has been an issue in several dockets, so I guess I'm trying to get some feedback, if you would, on that, on your best practices maybe of things that you might have come across on a national front, you know, hopefully things that -- things ultimately will go wrong, and there's a disconnect oftentimes between company and customer, but I wonder if you've got any feedback on item number two.

[No response]

**COMMISSIONER CLYBURN:** I guess not. I hope when I call your offices, if I'm a customer, that you won't be silent.

MR. TERRENI: I feel like we've dealt with enforceable standards and quality of water. I mean, unless somebody has anything to add about that, we seem to -- or, Commissioners, if you have any questions about any of these other topics that we've covered, or points

of clarification?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Is there a standard or a definition -- I've heard the secondary standards and all that. But is there -- does EPA define water quality anywhere, besides those parameters that you've laid out? Is there a -- you know, because when we're dealing with the issue, it's a customer service issue, a customer satisfaction issue. And how do you determine, you know -- we do struggle with that.

MR. KINARD: I think what it boils down to is that the EPA really doesn't define like different standards of water quality. I mean, it either meets all the applicable MCLs or it doesn't. And it's an either/or question. It's not, you know, it's pretty good and good and real good. I mean, it's -- the secondary MCLs are the closest we have to anything other than it either meets all the standards or it doesn't. It can meet -- it can not meet a secondary standard but still be considered safe to drink, so that's really the only dividing line I can think of that they have.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Any other questions?

Commissioner Howard?

commissioner Howard: I want to, I guess, follow up on Commissioner Wright's question awhile ago. Explain to me the safe drinking water revolving fund, and I

guess I read where it's like a company can save 20 percent using this fund than going to private sources. Other states -- there are some other states that private companies can withdraw from the state revolving fund. I guess I'd like to know how is the fund funded, and you already said you don't know why private companies can't withdraw from it, but just out of curiosity, working mechanisms of it, how it's funded, and if you've got any suggestion on how private companies -- if that's an ORS question, I'll -- how private companies could withdraw funds from it.

MR. KINARD: Well, it's funded through Congress and comes through EPA, but it's directly funded by Congress, and it's a loan fund, generally, where we give out low-interest loans. DHEC administers it, but the banking part of it, DHEC doesn't act as the bank for the fund; that's the Budget and Control Board. And please don't quote me, but my understanding is the Budget and Control Board is somehow -- their regulations are what keeps it from funding private. It's not -- in other words, it's not a DHEC decision not to do it. And I'm just thinking I've heard somewhere that it has something to do with their procedures at Budget and Control.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: You don't know if it's the federal or State that --

Well, no, it's the State rule. 1 MR. KINARD: COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: 2 It's a State -- there's 3 no --MR. FANTRY: I may be able to address that, because 4 I'm generally trying to get some of those funds, and 5 take water management off the hook. Can you hear me? 6 COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Yeah, the mic's on you. You 7 don't have to hold it up. 8 MR. FANTRY: All right, I've got it on. Yeah, I'm 9 10 talking into my -- certain funds of the EPA comes down and are restricted, they're bond funding and restricted 11 12 totally to public bodies and non- -- actually, public 13 bodies, and they lose their tax-exempt status, so the persons who are buying those bonds, if it's over 5 14 15 percent of the group that goes to either a non- -- to a 16 nonprofit body, if it's more than that then it loses its tax-exempt status so there's no market for the note. 17 18 The federal government puts some restrictions on 19 the Budget and Control Board with regard to the money 20 that came back down, the tobacco money, because I had two or three nonprofit water companies and they said, 21 when the law passed, had to be a public body, had to be 22 23 used by the public body, couldn't even go through the 24 public body. 25 So you'll find a combination of restrictions from

Washington on the money that says it's just got to be a public body, it's not open to that. Or it's a bond situation where they're going to sell the bond on the market, that the banks are not going to buy it unless it's tax-exempt and the federal IRS laws basically say if it's more than 5 percent of nonpublic body, then it doesn't qualify.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And maybe I'm all messed up here, but when a public system -- and you're talking about, you know, a city system, I assume, or a regional system of some kind?

MR. FANTRY: They are that. And then we actually have some 501(c)(12) nonprofit water systems in the State, about 52 of them.

**COMMISSIONER WRIGHT**: All right. But let's say that somebody wanted to purchase a nonviable private system, one of those public bodies.

MR. FANTRY: Right.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I think I've heard at some of the meetings we've been at that companies are not -- they can't take advantage of that here, just exactly what you talked about, because either the law is written wrong or it needs to be tweaked.

MR. FANTRY: The law specifically excludes them for almost all sorts of low-interest or bonded money. Now,

the State could --

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Well, I guess my question is,
is that right? Or should that be looked at?

MR. FANTRY: On what -- should it be looked at? I think people have looked at it. The question is do you want to provide funding for for-profit entities. Right now, the tax laws are such that you can't. In my mind, I was just saying, well, could the State just put a pool of money together, a revolving fund, and say everybody can use it, or we are just going to restrict it to those who are regulated entities on it, and I'm not so sure that that would pass Constitutional muster in regard to public purpose and the use of funds that are generated from taxes.

MR. TERRENI: We have a Universal Service Fund for telephones.

MR. FANTRY: Well, as I say, that would be the thing that would be -- if you were going to tweak it from a state level, I think it would be wonderful to have access to some of the funding, with the needs there, but it's not going to be under the present sources that are available today.

MR. TERRENI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: And as you said, you used the word "almost," so you said there's upwards of 5

percent. Because there are other states that, you know, that --

MR. FANTRY: Do not have the restriction.

**COMMISSIONER CLYBURN:** Exactly.

MR. FANTRY: Well, we've got some bond counsels in South Carolina, about five firms, and we've had -- I've had discussions about that, as to what percentage of the use is, because -- and basically, there are a couple of firms that say you don't have any nonprofits in there at all. "I'm not going to give you a bond opinion if you've got a nonprofit in there." There are a couple of other firms that say, "Well, you know, you get up to 5 percent, we'll wink at you. We're not happy about it." So, you know, sometimes bond counsels just won't write off on the financing, and that's why the nonprofits are being left behind and that's why the profits are being left behind. It's the financing vehicle.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Any other questions? Yes, sir.

MR. BRITTS: My agency, Southeast RCAP, is a nonprofit and we have a loan fund that is funded with some EPA money, some USDA rural development money, and also some private foundation charity money. So, we can loan to businesses and for-profits, and we loan in states from Delaware to Florida.

What I want to bring up to you is, we're shopping

around for customers. We've got money that we haven't loaned. I notice in South Carolina we have DHEC and Budget and Control Board has the State Revolving Loan Fund, and rural development, which is USDA, has about 20 million a year they would like to loan, and the PCD COG has a loan fund. The Pee Dee COG in Florence has a loan fund. It's like loan funds all around. So there's a lot of money out there, but it's not being lent because eligibility, creditworthiness, interest rate is too high. Our loan fund will go down as low as 2 percent if you're certifiably poor. You have to be really low to moderate income to get at the 2 percent rate.

One more thing. In Georgia, which seems to have a lot of money to lend, they have what they call subsidized loans. This is by their agency called G, for Georgia, Environmental Authorities Facility. And it used to be called negative interest rate. You borrow a million and you pay back 800,000. You do the math. You borrow a number and you pay back a lower number. So there's a grant subsidy in there somewhere.

But South Carolina and other states in our region don't have the subsidized loans, for whatever reason.

Just wanted to bring this information out to you, that there's a lot of agencies that would like to loan money but for some reason they don't loan all their money, so

1 they just --MR. TERRENI: Well, you may have more customers 2 3 after today. CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: That's right. You come to our 4 next rate case, and I'm sure you could get some 5 6 applicants. 7 [Laughter] CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: All right. Is there anything 8 9 else? Any other Commissioners? Commissioner Fleming? 10 **COMMISSIONER FLEMING:** Yeah, I wanted to go back to the subject of after work has -- if there's a problem, 11 12 work has been done and a yard is disrupted, or a street or whatever, I wanted to ask the utility companies what 13 they think is a good timeline to put the yard or road or 14 15 whatever back in order, back to its previous condition. MR. PARNELL: In the -- if we have to dig the yard 16 up, we would try to get it raked up and presentable, you 17 18 know, that day we were working on it. 19 COMMISSIONER FLEMING: So, you try to -- when you fix the problem, you try to put the yard back. 20 MR. PARNELL: Well, if it's a road, we'll cover it 21 with crush-and-run and let it sit, because it's going to 22 23 settle, and we'll let those sit for a week or two. 24 **COMMISSIONER FLEMING**: And then you maintain that? 25 MR. PARNELL: [Nodding head.]

**COMMISSIONER FLEMING**: How about your company?

MR. MITCHELL: Basically, we try to do the same thing. You may have to let a yard sit longer if it's a bigger dig, because you're going to have settling there too, so we do a lot of work where if somebody doesn't want grass seed, we'll actually go get sod and put it out, to try to bring it back.

Probably one of the biggest areas, though, that can come up sometimes is, you know, we're not supposed to have hard structures over our lines or easements, but concrete driveways are in there all the time, and you've got to let those settle, and somebody wants their driveway back, and if you've got to do just a spot dig, they want the whole driveway repaired. So it's -- you try to do the best you can with each situation.

**COMMISSIONER FLEMING:** So, how long would it take to settle the ground?

MR. MITCHELL: Depends on if it's rained, if it was -- if you had a blowout and you have really wet soil, you've got to let it dry out a lot longer than if you're just replacing a valve that had a minor leak, so it can depend on soil type, if it's sandy, clay. It's hard to put a -- you know, we're in there as quickly as we can, but you're at the whim of mother nature if it rains again in between.

1	COMMISSIONER FLEMING: So you think a two-week time
2	period is a good window?
3	MR. MITCHELL: Generally, unless you're like I
4	said
5	COMMISSIONER FLEMING: Unless there are
6	complications?
7	MR. MITCHELL: Complications, or you've got
8	concrete work to do and you've got you know, you try
9	to work with one vendor that you know, you're familiar
10	with. You don't want somebody to come in and pour a bad
11	driveway and have to tear it out and do it again.
12	MR. TERRENI: But in any event, you wouldn't leave
13	a hole?
14	MR. MITCHELL: We try not to leave a hole, no. In
15	some instances, there might be something that's left
16	overnight where you have to come back, but generally we
17	do not. We try to
18	COMMISSIONER FLEMING: And do you mark it well, so
19	people will know there's a hole?
20	MR. MITCHELL: It's not our policy to leave holes.
21	I'm not saying it doesn't happen. We use contractors
22	and sometimes they're out of our control a little bit.
23	MR. WELCH: I think some of your question, you
24	would build in a little bit of time and certainly
25	these guys can answer that better than me, but if there

is -- when they're repairing a line, we require they disinfect and then take a sample. If that sample comes back negative, they may need to get back in there and work again.

So I would think there would be a little bit of time built in there, like Mac said, depending on what the nature of the repair was or what you actually fixed or how much you had to dig up. You'd leave it not necessarily open, but not put back to regular use, in case you had to go back in.

**COMMISSIONER FLEMING:** But the customer would know that --

MR. WELCH: I would think so.

COMMISSIONER FLEMING: -- those are the conditions.

Could I -- I just want to say, well, first of all, how much I have appreciated hearing all the perspectives today. It's been very educational.

A lot of times these water hearings get very emotional. We all feel very passionate about what we drink and the conditions in our home. It would be so helpful to hear from someone like DHEC at these hearings. It kind of helps us balance out these emotions at times, and I think it would be a wonderful asset if we could get some expertise from DHEC when we have these hearings. I think it would really kind of

give us a good perspective on the overall picture. I really appreciate your being here today.

MR. KINARD: We appreciate that. I mean, I guess our only concern is sometimes we don't know when we're going to hurt or help. I mean, we don't want to come in -- we certainly don't want to come in and just start saying, well, you know, something is wrong with this group here, or something. You know, it's hard to know our place, I guess.

We certainly would be willing to come and testify about any type of water quality issues, any information we have that you all think is pertinent and you would like to hear about. We'll be more than happy to come and present any of that information, certainly.

**COMMISSIONER FLEMING**: And that's what I was talking about, just the facts, just the scientific information to balance it out. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: Any other questions? I'd like to echo Commissioner Fleming and tell you how much we appreciate each of you appearing here today and giving us the information you have. It's been very helpful to the Commission, and I think you'll see a lot of what you've heard today and what you've told us in the new reg's as we prepare them. Thank you very much for being here. We stand adjourned.

```
[WHEREUPON, at 2:45 \text{ p.m.}, on August 7,
 1
 2
                                      2007, the proceeding was adjourned.]
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
      Jo Elizabeth M. Wheat, CVR-CM-GNSC
      Certified Court Reporter
      Public Service Commission of South Carolina
      101 Executive Center Drive, Columbia SC 29210
      P.O. Box 11649, Columbia SC 29211
      2 (803) 896-5108
      Jo.Wheat@psc.sc.gov
29
```